

REMARKS

This application contains claims 1-32. Claims 1, 12 and 22 are hereby amended, and new claims 30-34 are added. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 12, 13 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Srivastava et al. (U.S. Patent 6,549,922) in view of Odom et al. (U.S. Patent 5,842,213). Claims 1, 12 and 22 have been amended to clarify the distinction of the present invention over the cited art.

Srivastava describes an extensible framework for the automatic extraction and transformation of metadata from media files into logical annotations. A type-specific parsing module, based on the mimetype of the media file in question, extracts the metadata from each file. The annotations from the media files are formatted into a standardized form, which is then mapped into a database schema (abstract). The object of this framework is to combine metadata stored in diverse proprietary formats, from multiple different sources and media, into a single, standard format (col. 1, lines 42-45). Srivastava makes no attempt to integrate the data from the different sources and media, but merely collects certain particular metadata that characterize the multimedia files, rather than the contents of the files themselves.

Odom describes a method for modeling, storing and transferring data in a non-hierarchical, non-integrated neutral form. This method is said to enable the direct integration of separate data models and their data (abstract). The method defines independent scope segment models and corresponding sets of information, which are automatically linked so as to function as the equivalent of a single model and set of information (col. 5, line 66 - col. 6, line 7).

Claim 1, as amended, recites a method for processing source data from diverse sources in a selected data domain, using a unified schema that is selected specifically for the selected data domain from among multiple schemata that are specific to different domains. Source data are mapped in accordance with correspondences defined between data fields and markup tags listed by the selected schema, in order to generate unified data in a markup language. "Domain" in this context means the application field to which the data pertain, such as the domain of computer system performance evaluation or the domain of customer relationship management (see page 3, lines 3-7, in the present patent application). The amendment to the claims is supported in the specification on page 4, lines 28-30, where it is noted that a different schema is preferably defined for each different domain in which the present invention is to be applied, thus providing a set of tags that is appropriate to the specific domain.

By contrast, as noted above, both Srivastava and Odom stress the importance of using a single schema for all data sources. Both of these references attempt to define means for organizing and access information in a standard, domain-independent format. Thus, they teach away from the method of amended claim 1, which recites the use of multiple, different schemata for different domains. The approach of the present invention permits the schema to be tailored in each case for the particular application requirements and semantics of the domain in question, in a manner that is neither taught nor suggested by the cited art. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, is patentable.

Independent claims 12 and 22 recite apparatus and a computer software product, respectively, which operate on principles similar to the method of claim 1. These claims have been amended in similar fashion to claim 1, and are therefore believed to be

patentable for the reasons stated above. In view of the patentability of claims 1, 12 and 22, claims 2, 13, 21 and 23, which depend from these claims, are believed to be patentable, as well.

Claims 3-11, 14-20 and 24-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Srivastava in view of Odom and further in view of one or more of Call (U.S. Patent 6,154,738), Draper (U.S. Patent 6,449,620), Kuwahara (U.S. Patent 6,202,072), Motoyama (U.S. Patent 5,504,891), Cianfrocca (U.S. Patent 6,088,796) and Kleinerman (U.S. Patent 6,041,365). Each of these claims depends from one of independent claims 1, 12 and 22. In view of the patentability of the amended independent claims, as explained above, claims 3-11, 14-20 and 24-29 are also believed to be patentable.

New claims 30-34 have been added to recite another aspect of the present invention that is believed to be patentable over the prior art. Claims 30-32 are independent claims, which recite a method, apparatus and computer software product in which source data are mapped to a markup language, based on a unified schema, responsively to a query in the markup language. These claims restate the limitations of dependent claims 11, 20 and 28 as filed, together with the limitations of the base claims and intervening claims from which these claims originally depended. Claims 33 and 34 are dependent claims, which are identical in language to original claims 28 and 29.


In rejecting claims 11, 20 and 28, the Examiner cited Draper (mentioned above), who describes pre-processing semi-structured queries in order to replace them with equivalent structured queries (abstract). The equivalent structured query can then be used to retrieve data from a collection of structured data (col. 2, lines 33-36). Draper, in other words, describes an approach that is opposite to that covered by claims 30-32: Whereas Draper processes queries to make them compatible with the structure of

given source data, claims 30-32 recite processing the source data to convert it to a markup language format dictated by the unified schema. Therefore, new claims 30-34 are believed to be patentable over the cited art.

Applicant has studied the additional references made of record by the Examiner, and believes the claims in the present patent application to be patentable over these references, as well, whether the references are taken individually or in any combination.

Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,



S. Peter Ludwig
Registration No. 25,351
Attorney for Applicant

Darby & Darby P.C.
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
(212) 527-7700